

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-8 were pending in the present application before this amendment as set forth above. By this amendment, claims 3-5 are amended, and claims 1, 2 and 6-8 are canceled.

In the May 28, 2008 Office Action, claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by US Patent No. 6,256,016 to Piot et al. (hereinafter "Piot"), claims 3-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Piot in view of US Patent No. 4,794,384 to Jackson (hereinafter "Jackson"), and claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Piot in view of Jackson, further in view of US Patent No. 5,703,356 to Bidiville et al. (hereinafter "Bidiville").

Applicant very appreciates the Primary Examiner's careful review of the present application.

In response, as set forth above, claims 3-5 have been amended for better form.

Additionally, without acquiescing in the propriety of the Primary Examiner's rejections and to facilitate the prosecution of the current application, claims 1, 2 and 6-8 have been canceled, which makes the Primary Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and/or §103 to claims 1, 2 and 6-8 moot.

Applicant asserts that no new matter is added.

Any amendments to the claims not specifically referred to herein as being included for the purpose of distinguishing the claims from cited references are included for the purpose of clarification, consistence and/or grammatical correction only.

It is now believed that the application is in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested.

The following remarks herein are considered to be responsive thereto.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

As set forth above, claims 1 and 2 have been canceled, which makes the Primary Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 to claims 1 and 2 moot.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claim 3, as amended, recites a method for processing optical signals in a computer mouse, characterized in that, “a laser beam is provided to illuminate the surface of an object, laser speckles are produced in the vicinity of the illuminated object surface; when the mouse is moving, the signals of the laser speckles are received by a photo sensor installed in the mouse, and the signals are processed, so as to calculate the quantity of laser speckle pulses received by the photo sensor, and to determine the relative displacement between the photo sensor and the illuminated object surface producing laser speckles on the basis of the average size of the speckles.”

In one embodiment of the present invention, when the speckle is passing through the pixel, the changes of the brightness of the speckle results in the changes of the output signal of the pixel, the changing times of the output signal of the pixel are collected and counted, the movement information of the laser speckle is calculated by multiplying the counted values of the output signal of the pixel and the average size of the laser speckles.

In contrast, as understood by applicant, Piot discloses a method of detecting movement of an optical pointing device, characterized in that, “the new unambiguous speckle image data signal generated by the photosensor arrays is captured in the storage medium (col.4, lines 48-50)”. In other words, Piot’s method requires the new speckle image data signal be collected and stored in the storage medium. Therefore, Piot teaches away from the method recited in amended claim 3 of the present invention.

Furthermore, in Piot, “[t]he new speckle image data signal and the previous speckle image data signal that are stored in the storage medium are then used to perform an image motion detection calculation, such as a cross-correlation analysis, using a cross-correlation module to determine the displacement of the two sets of speckle images. The calculated displacement corresponds to the movement of the optical pointing device.” (col.4, lines 50-57). Therefore, Piot’s method requires a method of cross-correlation analysis, which is distinctly different from the method recited in amended claim 3 of the present invention.

Additionally, Jackson discloses “means to determine the degree of correspondence of the values of adjacently positioned cells in consecutively produced samples. Said

means to determine comprises means to total the number of identical values achieved between a number of said array cells under consideration in a present samples as compared with neighboring adjacent cells of a previous sample aligned in orthogonal directions” (col. 12, lines 30-64). In other words, Jackson requires the degree of correspondence of the values of adjacently positioned cells be detected. Moreover, Jackson requires comparing with neighboring adjacent cells. However, as claimed in amended claim 1 of the present invention, the invented method requires calculating the quantity of laser speckle pulses. Therefore, Jackson teaches away from the method claimed in amended claim 1.

In other words, neither Piot nor Jackson, taken alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the method for processing optical signals in a computer mouse, recited in amended claim 3. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 3 is patentable over Piot nor Jackson.

Accordingly, amended claims 4 and 5, which depend from now allowable amended claim 3, are also patentable over Piot nor Jackson at least for this reason.

Claims 6-8 have been canceled, which makes the Primary Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 to claims 6-8 moot.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing Amendment and Response place this application in condition for allowance. If the Primary Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call the undersigned at 404-495-3678.

No fee is due, but the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any petition fee under 37 CFR 1.17(f), (g) or (h) or any deficiency of fees and credit of any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3537.

August 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

MORRIS, MANNING & MARTIN, LLP



Tim Tingkang Xia
Attorney for Applicant on the Record
Reg. No. 45,242

MORRIS, MANNING & MARTIN, LLP
1600 Atlanta Financial Center
3343 Peachtree Road, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30326-1044
Phone: 404-233-7000
Direct: 404-495-3678
Customer No. 24728